

11-7-02

Torture — absolute taboo?

like FU, torture could hypothetically, in
some cases, be justified

(see "medical marijuana"?)
"medical" morphine, heroin

but should be eschewed, foregone, because
of its dangers, precedent, slippery slope, abuse.

It is not practical to ban alcohol (in US:

see Muslim
countries)

or tobacco

(or, really marijuana. Coke, heroin?)

Is it practical to ban further prolif?

NOT (now): after 60 years of
two-tier system (undermining a
norm against prolif)

Possession? " "

But a multilateral ban on possession
is, or may be, possible, with inspiration
not on prolif, in context of real move
toward abolition.

But both non-prolif and abolition will
become vitally important after
next FU

and further prolif (tipping)

11-7-6

(nor can Type I Dist: det, or even ^{2d-use} ^{reprimand})
be subject to absolute ban / Taboo. UNLESS GLOBAL

FU, yes! { ~~dispute~~ certainly, of US — facing no
territorial threat,
Nikewar, NATO!
and even if it did,
Russia! possessing strong
(China!) alternatives.

Perm 5!

END OF
CW/SU/
Warsaw Pact
SHOULD MEAN
DISAPPEARANCE
OF LEGITIMATION
FOR FU THREAT

India?!
Japan

Pak (revoked Karim)
Israel (? revoked Pol)

(Berlin! divided Germany!)

Nov 1-06

① Take our "option" off table (from
and ~~any~~ table

② ~~ANFU~~ (How say this without enclosing
2d use/dts...

Acceptance of dts threat of 2d use
(of protection)

This has always been a work in US
(not Europe!)

for Type II

+ "D-L"
(also a cover)

+ see Japan

Korea

(Korea!)

Prior-tag: ^{of FU}

Ans. no

Mean - US attack

~~Ext~~ Extended foreign policy

(Maintain a colonial status quo)

("not expansionist,
or roll-back; just

- ME

SEA

imperial S.G.:

Korea

on borders of SU, China

(i.e. divided Korea, Berlin)

(How did Saddam subordinate Shi'a so long in Iraq?!

Was Baath + any all Sunni? Police?

(not Saddam!)

11-1-06

from ~~of~~ Ban is "intolerable, unacceptable."

kill? Cuba

MRBMs in Cuba

defeat in VN (NVN)
547

in fact (foral)

from legal program (dual-purpose)
is intolerable; it has crossed one red-line,
another is "if the western..."

(yet from has not (late) broken
any rules

nor is doing not unboly compatible
with (suff. explained by) its claim of
only having full-cycle war energy (= shock)

Ban-buster does not absolute the
UNGA position...

(kill 10,000 - 1st M)

Deaths of non-prolif

Prolif inevitable

Further Use "

(unless world meeting,
i.e. US ~~propos~~ Wbink

conf - against US leadership,
not led by US - would
contemplate going up its own
rules...

Would US lead in reverse direction?

Tell this, we can hope + strive, with
much on our side; after...

(like after invasion of Iraq: or of 2004, late 03...)

frag as symbol of irreversible damage

(Katharine?)

Compare WTC, Katharine to frag!

(1)

"Thinking about what should be irreversible"

like HK

irreversible,
evil
un-doable

HAK as adviser

1969 threats!

Morris

(

not just,
brigades,
ambal:
death
career
militarist

Does NATO endorse this?

(What use against possessors of CW (BW)?

— "like SH" (bilateral) — though non-use?!

(No longer a threat of massive conventional
forces to NATO: or CW/BW

to argue, threat of being attacked?
by a state

Non-state possession: addressed both

in context of NP-II

of Bush election, "counter-prolif
+ no other NP measures, not actual
prolif, US use...

NPT has been effective — during CW — and

even after! (NK, (Iran) directly threatened)

Effort to assert some equality w. US —

in what respect? That attention, negot w. US

assurance of non-attack (NK, Iran

By the time this is published, it may have
happened or then we will have to...

If not, the risk remains esp. high at least
through 2008

(Our task is less promising now than it
seemed in 1989 1992 (START II
after CW

(or 1990? before Gulf War?)

[frag. see

If we attack from ...

(effort on proving us if we don't

use ones appearing

and "diplomatically," i.e. thanks

as "beginning chips" blackmail

NUC BLACKMAIL

[How many countries - which? - have (or are
getting) the option for a bank that
won't have, or can't program?
U-235? PU? (Japan, both?)

and: Harris?

Kimball?

Grinnell?

HAR ① Demand for "cred" (about sanction)

② + threat (of banks?)

③ Are any expenses, '69 new?

④ Are about!

Effects of massive attack (can proceed on one
facilities) will have some effects on prohib
as a new attack (to get Type II - like NATO + NK:)

(single friendly countries that go new - the

|| change hands: Egypt, S.A., (Pak

using (see Algeria

South Africa

SU - on one of back-up

Ukraine, etc.

China?

Woodward reminds: HAR Demand best lessons
from VN, and still applies them!

Must we say on US "new umbrella"?

(Japan (2) Germany - CW

Taiwan

South Korea

Kiss:

"Type I det only" (despite NATO)

Public Inquiry, NFO
in practice

- Pass alone controls"

-

v

Nov 1

|| Pat - We are trying to dissuade
other (for) from signing arms, by using
ours - against them!

Not only encouraging emulation -
demonstrating that we think weapons are usable
and valuable, are necessary, even for us
(in "diplomacy" - and possibly, also, war -

and, we are trading this to the neighbors
(like Israel - who needs no working - at
also Egypt...) (or S.A. - who could use Samson
option, like French, Israel, South Africa)

but also, directly threatening them (from: not
NK (OR PAK) requiring them to seek our
det option as fast as possible. (BUY IT?)

(I am not "revealing" the usability to any of
the nations we have threatened, or who have
used Samson Option on us, or planned to:
[inf to US public...]

formal NOC threat (plan)
(unless fully covered with non-nuc
weapons)

from them as (Skite!) base after
AQ-like terror
(in Iraq, as well as US!)

[What is breakdown of Shia & Sunni in
US? UK? Germany? France?
(Algeria, Morocco?)

Are threats of force v. seen "credible" — or
bluffs (as from leaders think?
+ Simon "experts" — Kimball 2-28-05

= crazy!
=
=

Hao

Use from around of FC Threat after end
of CW than earlier (C-II, Reagan...)

— ~~Other~~ degrees of are threats
(Dad)

[Our ship of state has been de-jocked by pirates!
(Who? ~~Ref~~)
We are all passengers on Flight 93: (get)

"On the table?" Bush is planning to kick over
the table: "

Is Bush "using" Hersh through N's sources?

Are his sources all fooled — or part of the
tactic? (Wf doesn't one revolt : resign

with does, that and Vain : (+ a force)

sign his name
take an oath

and have other witnesses
+ perpetrators

Google "option"

NSA (in lieu of NFU — thank you, NATO
(still, in 2002!)

Do we want to have Peru possess a
credible "FV threat" in the way of its intentions of diplomacy &
influence?

However, regret a NFO ~~to~~ being?
During CW, yes (for Europe; though NSA, 1978, Vance)
^{not then}

(Bush's statement violates NSA — but not NFO,
which US has always
violated)
(unless we claim there is in
violation of NPT!)

Bush implies, says it: TAREA does not.

+ referred, in NSM-1

see Mr/HAR/TCS

"Option" contradicts NSA ¹⁹⁷⁸ ²⁹⁹⁵ (2000?)
2002 ^{date}
as in for-File 03.

opposed by ECK...

(Bobin Cooke to Blair)...

An answer: not on table; we stand by NSA
in 1991, 2003, from is not a one state
or 2006;
does abide by NPT

("BUT — persons full full
cycle,"

permitted, but...

Forest Fire Option

^{didn't} ^{em in 1978}
(NSA doesn't concur: Pol, formal, formal, NK
^{on the}
any "rogue" non-nuc states?

Isenmani Option

Cause Fast
General Warning option ("Drawn'em")

other than ^{SH} frag (we suspect
intentions —

Suspense Court
Option

NK are telling non-nuc states...

"like India,
Pol, formal
(draw, NK)

Assessing
Option

"Option" = on same "loaden" as other, non-nuc
options.

(see "Doomsday Option")

Police State
Option

Dictatorship Option

Assessing; Rwanda Option (E2 bal...)

Physicists responding (April 17) as Frank/
Seydman did to Hershman Option (Nagasaki Option)
SEE Hersh: "Tough, but we made it in

But what Seydman should have done 1945 Hershman
or Office-Commit in 1949-50 H
or in 1952-53 (testing)
(Office was disrupted)

(VCS in 1956-60 (Kao)^{VN})

1966 - Russell? She!

Vs. Tool (Shane: gun)

is Toolbox (vs. unbalanced facilities: C³? CW/BW

and to result in immediate proof ^{look of Mount}
and simulation

unusually open - yet no big resistance
(compare Reagan!)
or 1969/72!

^{new public}
No taboo against offensive war

(Vs. Ruben's problem: A world in which FU stands
on nose, of US, without an challenger or effective
opposition, is not a world in which abolition
(or even major reduction) of abundance of deterrence
of anyone has a prayer of a hope.

DANEGROUS

Krugman?

who opposed "NFU" on grounds it "legitimized"

det/2d-use. [I OPPOSE VIEWS THAT TO MOVE TOWARD
ABOLITION ONE MUST TOTALLY DE-LEGITIMIZE
TYPE-I DET - RATHER, ULT. FORGO IT, AS TOO

Bush's use of over the year ^{is 2006} will encourage
prob'ly

just as Iraq War has ~~strengthened~~ terrorism

It's not "the first in 60 years" (APs)

It endangers US security, and the world.

lack of opposition - accepting it as an "option"
(PSR - better than H+N + Johnson...)

makes it more likely to be carried out,
used offensively (explaining: is "combat"?)

losing our security for more
(as a non-acc)

yet states don't want to be accused of
defining Pres of options (as does NSA? ignored
in 1991, 2003)

(Why didn't NPT include NSA?')

As assurance of no attack (as "regime change")
"on the table" if then suspects
enrichment under inspection?

[What if then "aided Hezbollah"?]
or Shia in Iraq?

"Crisis"

shows for disability use plan

- No one has resigned
- No deces released (yet)
- Anon sources ("Hend")

11-3-06

TCS finds it "astounding" that, as he sees it,
no one came close to considering serious
FU since 1945-2005 60 years

It is astounding that no one was concerned —
give actual recent history — 20+ occasions of
threats + readiness, most "series"!

The history of the history is also "astounding" —
or at least, noteworthy.

Even more — the recent readiness of presidents
to threaten or intimidate FU is the actual circumstances
(NEVER, WWII-like circumstances, or even November)

and the ^{recent} existence of the S.O.P.s, with full marching
to execute them

from now = Bush's Cuban Missile Crisis: human
race cap, "equality," as intolerable = worthy
of (one-sided!) war to prevent,
ending of (public) "taboo."

"Taboo" has helped prevent some threats from
being carried out when they failed;

but it has not prevented threats, readiness,
non-beliefs, actual readiness of some pres.
to execute and of all to risk it + threaten it.

Investigate sources for doublet use plan

"Contingency"

- No one has resigned

- No deaths released (yet)

- Anon sources ("Herald")

Bush's use of ones ^{in 2006} this year will encourage
Arabif

just as Iraq War has strengthened terrorism

It's not "the first in 60 years" (APS)

It endangers US security, and the world's.

lack of opposition - accepting it as an "option"
(PSR - being more than H+N + Tokyo...)

makes it more likely to be carried out,
used offensively (apologizing: in "context"?)

leaving our security for more
(as a non-area)

yet states don't want to be accused of
defining Pres of options (as does NSA? forward
in 1991, 2003)

(Why didn't NPT include NSA?')

As assurance of no attack (as "regime change")
"on the table" if the suspects
involved under investigation?

[What if from "aid to Hezbollah"?]
or Shin in Iraq?

Nov 3-06

- A NWS (US) will feel free to attack a NNWS with non-nuc weapons, because if the NNWS puts up a strong defense (e.g. submarines) it risks loc. to one-sided nuc attack (Korea; Indochina; even Iran c.e. its intention to get nukes is to deter ~~large~~ non-nuc attack as well as nuc attack/threat.

(US threatened a (inferior) nuc state: SU, in '62...
China & VN

11-10-06

Terror Symposium NY

[American attitudes toward the war:
State of Denial

+ ignorance

(large proportion don't know any nation
has used nucs

or, US ... vs. Hiroshima + Nagasaki

(FU? Dick Mitchell thought US had a
goal of ~~not~~ faster NFU policy.

Q: ^{NWS} What countries aside from US have a
NFU policy?

(China but, Taiwan)

Is then, the US the only country with a
NFU policy?

(No signal is sent for WMD like mushroom cloud

personal
Frank

Constant alarm/fears about nucs built - with
no new wars - erodes fear: very hard opposite,
calming effect

[Like warnings about terrorism - & no attacks
since

11-10-06

Ferraro Symposium NY

~~hammer~~

Wittman: "We weapons cannot be built by a terrorist group, only by a state."

"they require getting them for a war state."

(NO)

U-235
PU?

Best way to avert war terrorism is to
eliminate national war arsenals. (NO)

senior high - senior college scientists, engineers.

+ U235

~~Heisenberg~~

UCNWCCP

Has there been a change in norms?

Against fire-bombing:

(V8; ^{WWII} (Korea)

(yes)

Q to Keynote: Was Aesthetics emphasized, since there was
no war war?

Keynote: "Lesson of CMC: crimes can be managed."

Risk: out of control.

If original plans had gone down, we would
have gone - would as we know it (Europe, SU)
would not exist.